United Nations A/C.5/65/SR.27

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
27 January 2011

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 27th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 23 December 2010, at 11 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Rosenthal ..... (Guatemala)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Ms. McLurg

Contents

Agenda item 134: Human resources management (*continued*)

Agenda item 136: United Nations common system (*continued*)

Agenda item 139: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

Agenda item 128: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

Agenda item 140: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 141: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*)

Agenda item 142: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

10-70493 (E)

Agenda item 144: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (*continued*)

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (*continued*)

Agenda item 148: Financing of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (*continued*)

Agenda item 153: Financing of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (*continued*)

Agenda item 157: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (*continued*)

Agenda item 129: Programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (continued)

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials: members of the International Court of Justice and judges and ad litem judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (continued)

Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011

Contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

Agenda item 128: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Procurement (continued)

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2012-2013 (continued)

Completion of the Committee's work at the main part of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 p.m.

Agenda item 134: Human resources management (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.15)

1. **The Chair** said that, because of time constraints, the documents necessary for the conduct of the meeting were available only in English. However, he had been assured by Secretariat officials that those documents would be made available in all six official languages as soon as possible.

2. **Mr. Doré** (France), speaking on a point of order, said it was an established requirement that the documents necessary for the conduct of official meetings should be available in the six official languages. However, his delegation was willing to waive that requirement in order to enable the Committee to complete its work without further delay.

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.15: Human resources management

3. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the words "and taking into account the provisions of resolution 65/___" should be added at the end of paragraph 1. The number of the resolution on the United Nations common system would be inserted once that resolution had been adopted by the General Assembly.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.15, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

Agenda item 136: United Nations common system (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.16)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.16: United Nations common system

5. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.16 was adopted.*

Agenda item 139: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

Agenda item 128: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.9)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.9: Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on its activities

6. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.9 was adopted.*

Agenda item 140: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.17)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.17: Administration of justice at the United Nations

7. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.17 was adopted.*

Agenda item 141: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.18: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

8. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.18 was adopted.*

Agenda item 142: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.19)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.19: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

9. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.19 was adopted.*

Agenda item 144: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.11)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.11: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.11 was adopted.*

Agenda item 147: Financing of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.12)

Agenda item 148: Financing of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.12)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.12: Financing arrangements for the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo for the period from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011

11. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.12 was adopted.*

Agenda item 153: Financing of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.13)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.13: Financing arrangements for the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti for the period from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011

12. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.13 was adopted.*

Agenda item 157: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.14: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan

13. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.14 was adopted.*

Agenda item 129: Programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.20)

Draft decision A/C.5/65/L.20: Programme budget implications relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011

14. **The Chair** said that the representative of Israel had requested a recorded vote on section C of draft decision A/C.5/65/L.20.

15. **Mr. Al-Shahari** (Yemen), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action had been the outcome of a process initiated by General Assembly resolution 61/149, the aim of which had been to focus world attention on the contemporary challenges of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. At its 52nd meeting, the Third Committee had adopted, by a resounding majority, draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.60, as orally revised, whereby the General Assembly would decide to convene on 21 September 2011 a high-level meeting of the General Assembly to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The purpose of the event would be to mobilize global political will to eradicate racism, racial discrimination and related intolerance.

16. The Group reaffirmed the relevance and validity of the commemorative meeting and fully supported the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.60. It also reaffirmed the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, in particular rule 153. The Group maintained that, once a statement of programme budget implications had been submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee, the status of such a statement became the sole prerogative of the latter. In that connection, it should be recalled that the Fifth Committee had the prerogative to consider the administrative and budgetary aspects of the Organization's activities.

17. The Group was disappointed by the targeting of the statement of programme budget implications related to the commemorative meeting and by the efforts to block implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The Group would not allow any attempt to stop the commemorative meeting to succeed.

18. The Group regretted that a vote had been requested in connection with an event aimed at forging harmony, tolerance and understanding. It therefore urged all delegations to vote in favour of section C of the draft decision.

19. *At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on section C of draft decision A/C.5/65/L.20.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire,

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine.

20. *Section C of draft decision A/C.5/65/L.20 was adopted by 102 votes to 17, with 33 abstentions.*

21. **Mr. Melrose** (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the adoption of section C, just as it had voted against the draft resolution to which it related (A/C.3/65/L.60), because it had serious concerns about the activities that were to be funded. The cost of those activities could have been absorbed and his delegation regretted that no consensus had been reached regarding such a course of action.

22. **Mr. De Preter** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union remained committed to the eradication of racism, racial discrimination and related intolerance. Nonetheless, his delegation wished to reiterate the concerns it had expressed in the Third Committee regarding the draft resolution to which section C related. The Fifth Committee was the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and its focus should thus be confined to those matters.

23. With regard to rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he recalled that, when the Third Committee had adopted the draft resolution, no statement of programme budget implications had been made available. It had therefore been assumed that the costs arising from draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.60 would be absorbed.

24. *Draft decision A/C.5/65/L.20 as a whole was adopted.*

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials: members of the International Court of Justice and judges and ad litem judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (continued) (A/C.5/65/L.21)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.21: Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials: members of the International Court of Justice and judges and ad litem judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

25. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.21 was adopted.*

Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (A/C.5/65/L.22)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22: Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011

26. **Mr. Bayat Mokhtari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation wished to propose an oral amendment to section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22. The proposed amendment, which would become paragraph 3 of section XIII, would read:

"*Decides* not to approve the requested posts and financial resources for the panel of experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran".

27. He reiterated that his delegation regarded all Security Council resolutions that imposed sanctions on the Islamic Republic of Iran to be unlawful. Consequently, any attempt to provide posts and allocate resources to implement those resolutions was also unlawful. His delegation could not countenance the adoption of a resolution supporting action that directly affected the national security of the Islamic Republic of Iran. He urged all delegations to support the proposed amendment.

28. **Mr. Roscoe** (United Kingdom), supported by **Mr. Doré** (France), expressed opposition to the proposed oral amendment, requested a recorded vote on it and urged all delegations to vote against it.

29. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that his delegation supported the oral amendment that had been proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

30. At the request of the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In favour:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Philippines, Senegal, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

31. *The oral amendment proposed by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran was rejected by 79 votes to 11, with 36 abstentions.*

32. **Mr. De Preter** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Fifth Committee was the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and that its focus should thus be confined to those matters.

33. The Panel of Experts on the Islamic Republic of Iran had been established pursuant to Security Council resolution 1929 (2010) in order to carry out the tasks specified in paragraph 29 of that resolution. His delegation believed that it was the Committee's responsibility to ensure that the Panel was given the funding it required in order to implement its mandate and related functions effectively. The proposed oral amendment would have deprived the Panel of all resources and prevented it from carrying out its vital tasks. It was for those reasons that the States members of the European Union had voted against the proposed amendment.

34. **Ms. Giménez-Jiménez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation wished to propose the insertion of an additional paragraph under section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22, which would read, "*Requests* the Secretary-General to review the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of

Genocide, taking into account the concerns expressed at the variation of the narratives as contained in paragraphs 44, 46, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61 and 63 of the Secretary-General's report A/65/328/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2 from the strategic framework of the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide as contained in the Secretary-General's report A/64/349/Add.1, in order to ensure that its programmatic aspects and resource requirements are consistent with the legislative mandates of relevant intergovernmental bodies, and to issue a technical review and report thereon to the General Assembly no later than the early part of its first resumed session of the sixty-fifth session, based on the logical framework accepted by the General Assembly in its resolution 64/245 as contained in the Secretary-General's report A/64/349/Add.1".

35. Given that the concept of responsibility to protect had not been approved by the relevant intergovernmental bodies, its inclusion in the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide represented a serious failure of the Organization's budget procedures. About a year earlier, when the General Assembly had engaged in its first substantive discussion on the responsibility to protect, Member States had agreed only on the need to continue evaluating and considering the concept. The General Assembly had subsequently adopted resolution 63/308, in which it took note of the report of the Secretary-General on implementing the responsibility to protect (A/63/677) and decided to continue its consideration of the matter. Yet the logical framework now presented by the Secretary-General sought to implement recommendations made in the Secretary-General's follow-up report on early warning, assessment and the responsibility to protect (A/64/864), in respect of which the General Assembly had taken no action whatsoever. Her delegation was concerned that the expansion of the Special Adviser's mandate to incorporate those recommendations could imply that the concept of responsibility to protect had been agreed on and accepted, and would consequently lead to its implementation. That would constitute a failure to analyse and understand the real root causes of conflict. Given the importance of the matter for civilian populations and States alike, the Organization's work on the concept of responsibility to protect should involve detailed and in-depth discussion.

36. While the international community could play a constructive role in supporting national efforts, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of national sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference, the primary responsibility to protect lay with States themselves. She therefore urged all delegations to support the oral amendment.

37. **Mr. Lafortune** (Canada) said that he wished to request a recorded vote on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. His delegation opposed the proposed amendment and urged all other delegations to vote against it.

38. **Ms. Claringbould** (Netherlands) said that her delegation also wished to request a recorded vote on the proposed amendment and would vote against it. While her delegation did not agree with the narrative suggested by the Venezuelan delegation, its main reason for requesting a recorded vote was that it believed that the substance of the proposed amendment fell outside the scope of the Committee's functions as the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters. She invited other delegations to vote against the proposed amendment.

39. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation supported the proposed amendment and called on all Member States to vote in favour of it. His delegation was unhappy at the way in which the Committee had been forced to consider, and possibly adopt, the proposed resource requirements for special political missions, and in particular, the funding proposals contained in section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22, which Cuba could not support. He also wished to highlight the arrogant and condescending attitudes of some delegations, the delaying tactics employed and the participation of unauthorized persons in discussions on the issue during the Committee's informal consultations. Some European and North American delegations, before finally deciding to request a vote themselves on the proposed amendment, had sought to put pressure on delegations from developing countries to do so. His delegation was grateful to the countries of the Group of 77 and China for having resisted such shameful tactics, which should be condemned.

40. The proposals contained in the report of the Secretary-General on estimates in respect of special political missions (A/65/328/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2) relating to the work of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide clearly violated the rules and procedures of the General Assembly with regard to the treatment of logical frameworks and the presentation of narratives in budget documents. It was unacceptable that concepts that were still under discussion by the General Assembly, and in respect of which there were acknowledged differences of opinion, should be included in logical frameworks as if they were mandates approved by Member States. In that connection, his delegation failed to understand the basis for the Secretariat's opinion that its own reports established legislative mandates. The General Assembly had not adopted any resolution endorsing the notion that the responsibility to protect was a core mandate of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide or agreeing that the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect should be part of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide.

41. While his delegation was aware of the good intentions with which some countries of the global South were promoting the establishment of the responsibility to protect as a rule of international law, the issue gave rise to a number of legitimate concerns that could not be ignored. In particular, there was a real danger that the concept could end up being manipulated by interventionist States seeking to justify interference and the use of force. Many of the States that claimed to champion the concept of responsibility to protect had, for decades, been unilaterally declaring war on various developing countries, causing the death of millions of people as well as substantial material losses. His delegation was not calling on the international community and the United Nations to remain impassive in the face of genocide and other crimes; on the contrary, it had always maintained that the serious problems afflicting millions of human beings around the world should be urgently addressed. However, it was convinced that that could be achieved only through the establishment of an international order based on solidarity, social justice, equity and respect for human rights. History clearly showed that peace, stability and development could not be imposed by force and that military operations did not lead to lasting solutions. The principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States must be upheld to ensure that small nations were not left at the mercy of larger, stronger States. His delegation opposed any use of force outside the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The current unjust and profoundly unequal international order could not be replaced by a more primitive order based on a reinterpretation of the Charter and international law.

42. His delegation opposed the attempts of some delegations to apply the concept of responsibility to protect before it had been clearly defined and agreed on by the General Assembly. No clear consensus existed on that concept; moreover, the Secretariat's actions had poisoned discussions on the issue in the General Assembly. Consequently, the logical framework, as presented to the Committee, would never again be adopted without a vote.

43. **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation supported the statements made by the representatives of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Cuba. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed amendment and called on all other Member States to do the same. The change in the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide was based on a report of the Secretary-General that had not been subject to any action by the General Assembly, and thus represented a "back-door" attempt to introduce the concept of responsibility to protect. The Secretariat was thereby seeking, not for the first time, to establish its own mandates, in clear violation of the legislative mandates and intergovernmental nature of the Organization. It had thus become impossible for the General Assembly to continue discussing such a sensitive issue in good faith. He wondered whether the Secretariat was trying to deceive the General Assembly and convince it that good faith existed when discussions on the issue had in fact been permanently poisoned.

44. His delegation also regretted the arrogance shown by some delegations in informal consultations, with their use of delaying tactics and inappropriate arguments, as well as their disdain for the positions of other sovereign States. His delegation rejected such attitudes, which confirmed the bad faith that existed on the issue and the unwillingness of some delegations to enter into constructive dialogue on the logical framework in question. Nicaragua would continue to oppose any arrogant attempts to impose a consensus where none existed. As the representative of Cuba had

emphasized, no consensus existed on the concept of responsibility to protect, and no consensus would exist in the future. The logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide would not be adopted by consensus again until the necessary rectifications had been made. His delegation would continue to call the Secretariat to account whenever the opportunity arose, thereby ensuring that accountability was not just an empty word.

45. **Mr. De Preter** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, said that, as the Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, the Committee should consider the administrative and budgetary aspects of the items before it and refrain from discussions that belonged in other United Nations forums. The Committee was responsible for ensuring that the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide was adequately funded to discharge its mandate and carry out all related functions. In that regard, the European Union considered that the Office's activities, as proposed by the Secretary-General in his report (A/65/328/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2), were fully justified by decisions of the General Assembly and Security Council. The States members of the European Union would therefore vote against the proposed amendment and invited other delegations to do the same.

46. *At the request of the representatives of Canada and the Netherlands, a recorded vote was taken on the oral amendment proposed by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.*

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Qatar, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

47. *The oral amendment proposed by the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was rejected by 68 votes to 17, with 51 abstentions.*

48. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that his delegation wished to request a recorded vote on section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22. That request, however, should not be interpreted as meaning that his delegation did not support the other requests for the financing of special political missions, particularly those that concerned developing countries.

49. **Ms. Costa** (Brazil) said it was her delegation's understanding that the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, as set forth in the relevant report of the Secretary-General (A/65/328/Add.1 and Corr.1 and 2), broadly corresponded to the mandate that had been established by the General Assembly. Her delegation believed that the logical framework did not prejudge the discussion on the responsibility to protect currently under way in the General Assembly.

50. Her delegation nonetheless shared the concerns that had been expressed regarding the logical frameworks of special political missions. Unfortunately, the current budget process for such missions did not allow for proper intergovernmental consideration of the related logical frameworks. Such frameworks should be formulated in a way that accurately expressed the relevant mandates as objectives and indicators of achievement. Greater effort should be made to achieve consistency in the presentation of the budgets of special political missions.

51. **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation would vote against section XIII of the draft resolution because the Venezuelan oral amendment on the Office of the Special Adviser had been rejected. Although his delegation supported the allocation of resources for the other special political missions to be funded under the draft resolution, it could not support the adoption of section XIII.

52. **Ms. Giménez-Jiménez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would also vote against section XIII of the draft resolution in order to express its rejection of the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser, not the other special political missions.

53. *At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam.

Against:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Solomon Islands, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

54. *Section XIII of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22 was adopted by 130 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.*

55. **Mr. Bayat Mokhtari** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation wished to request a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22 as a whole.

56. *At the request of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22 as a whole.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark,

Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of).

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Myanmar, Syrian Arab Republic.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22 was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.*

58. **Mr. Yanouka** (Israel) said that his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on section IX of draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.22.

59. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, that action should not be interpreted to mean that his Government endorsed the logical framework of the Office of the Special Adviser. His delegation was deeply concerned by the manner in which Member States had been asked to take action on the budgets for special political missions. The process by which those budgets were presented and the Committee's working methods regarding special political missions should change.

Contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates (A/C.5/65/14)

60. **The Chair** drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General on the contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates (A/C.5/65/14).

61. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, should the Committee proceed as recommended in paragraph 4 of the report, the General Assembly would be requested to note that a balance of $22,408,100 remained in the contingency fund.

62. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should note that a balance of $22,408,100 remained in the contingency fund.

63. *It was so decided.*

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/65/L.23)

64. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft report of the Fifth Committee and invited the Committee to take action on the recommendations contained in chapter IV.

Draft resolution I: Questions relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (A/C.5/65/L.21 and L.22)

Draft decision I: United Nations Fund for International Partnerships

65. **The Chair** recalled that draft resolution I had been adopted earlier in the meeting and that draft decision I had been orally introduced and adopted at the Committee's 6th meeting.

Draft resolution II: Programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011

66. *Draft resolution II was adopted.*

Draft decision II: Capital master plan

67. *Draft decision II was adopted.*

68. **The Chair** invited the Committee to adopt the draft report of the Fifth Committee on the programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011 (A/C.5/65/L.23).

69. *The draft report of the Fifth Committee was adopted.*

Agenda item 128: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Procurement (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.24)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.24: Procurement

70. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.24 was adopted.*

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2012-2013 (*continued*) (A/C.5/65/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.25: Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2012-2013

71. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, based on the decisions that the Committee had taken thus far, the amount noted in paragraph 5 should be $5,396,697,200, while the amount in paragraph 11 should be $40,475,200.

72. *Draft resolution A/C.5/65/L.25, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

Completion of the Committee's work at the main part of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly

73. **Mr. Soomro** (Pakistan), noting that the human resources management reform process begun at the sixty-first session of the General Assembly was now culminating in the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 63/250, said that United Nations field staff should be provided with a level of compensation commensurate with the hardship they faced, to ensure that they were fully dedicated to the Organization's work. His delegation was confident that administration of justice support and performance management in respect of those staff members would also be strengthened in the light of guidance from the General Assembly. Furthermore, it was to be hoped that the human resources management scorecard would be fully evaluated; in that regard, effective monitoring of the system and regular reporting were essential.

74. His delegation looked forward to the effective implementation of General Assembly resolutions and the attainment of key benchmarks in such areas as geographical representation, gender balance, representation of troop-contributing countries and the criteria for continuing contracts, and trusted that all General Assembly resolutions would be interpreted and implemented in the spirit in which they had been adopted.

75. **Mr. Seyoum** (Eritrea) said that the late issuance of documentation was still a problem, despite the Committee's repeated insistence on the need for reports of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to be issued in a timely manner so that the Committee could give proper consideration to the various agenda items before it. At the current session, the late issuance of the reports on estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council was a clear case in point. The General Assembly should take measures to achieve a permanent solution to the problem, which was hindering the Committee's work.

76. The intrusion of politics into the work of the Fifth Committee and, by extension, the Advisory Committee was an even bigger problem that his delegation had observed in recent years. If the Committee members allowed politics to divide them, their ability to fulfil their common purpose would be diminished. He urged all delegations to remember that they were serving a cause larger than themselves, maintain a human face in their deliberations and focus on what they could do together to make a difference in the lives of the people they served. Otherwise, multilateralism was doomed.

77. After an exchange of courtesies, in which **Mr. Al-Shahari** (Yemen), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, **Mr. De Preter** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, **Mr. Coffi** (Côte d'Ivoire), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, **Mr. Soomro** (Pakistan) and **Mr. Seyoum** (Eritrea) took part, **the Chair** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the main part of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.50 a.m. on Friday, 24 December 2010.